Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/531,851	PENDERGAST ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	L. E. Crane	1623
All Participants:	Status of Application:	
(1) <u>L. E. Crane</u> .	(3)	
(2) <u>Viola T. Kung</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: 19 November 2007	Time: <u>2:00 PM</u>	·
Type of Interview:  ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicate ☐ Applicate ☐ Applicate ☐ Yes, provide a brief description:	ant's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed:		
None	÷	
Claims discussed: None		
Prior art documents discussed: None		· .
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENE See Continuation Sheet	RAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	S DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
<ul> <li>☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate of directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate of did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summar</li> </ul>	e examiner will provide a writtor record of the substance of the	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview
•		
		•
	•	
		•
M.Comer-		
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicant	t/Applicant's Representative Si	gnature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

Applicant was advised that the request for declaration of an interference was found to be inappropriate because the most relevant claims of the '188 patent and the instant application as amended did not pass the necessary two-way test, and therefore that the claims as amended had been found allowable.